reduced to certain propositions. There was a lot of publicity for the rally. In spite of it if the Hon'ble Member pleads ignorance about it and says that nothing has been done, it will not be fair to that big organisation.

Lastly, I come to the very vital problem of land reforms though it was not touched by many speakers. The Revenue Minister is also here to know the views of members on this question of land reforms. Land reforms are necessary to infuse new life in the rural areas and that is why the Revenue Minister did not want to miss this opportunity. Whatever criticisms are made by members on the land reforms will be taken into consideration by him and he will make it acceptable to the House and that will usher a new era in the rural areas.

In conclusion I hope that Sri Veerappa will see light and understand the problem in its proper perspective and withdraw the resolution because the resolution as it is worded will not serve any purpose. If he has got any specific problems, he can take it up on some other occasion. With these few words I would make a special appeal to the Hon'ble Member to withdraw the resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—In view of the reply given by the Hon'ble Minister does the Hon'ble Member wish to withdraw the resolution ?

Sri Y. VEERAPPA.—I elect to press the resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—The question is:

"This Assembly is of the opinion that a committee of both officials and non-officials be constituted with a view to examine and report on the critical problems of agriculturists in the State and to suggest solution for their betterment and augmentation of food productions."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—The resolution is lost.

(Sri B. T. Murnal was not present when the first resolution was called).

Constitution of Standing Committees for each Ministry

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—Sir, I beg to move:

"This Assembly is of the opinion that a Standing Committee for each Ministry be constituted consisting of not more than seven members of the Legislature with the Minister in-charge of the portfolio, to advise Government on the administration of the Department concerned."

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—Motion moved:

"This Assembly is of the opinion that a Standing Committee for each Ministry be constituted consisting of not more than seven members of the Legislature with the Minister in-charge of the portfolio, to advise Government on the administration of the Department concerned."

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—I beg to move the following amendment to the motion:

'In line 2 for the words "for each Ministry" substitute the words "for the Finance Ministry;"

In lines 4 and 5 at the end substitute the words "Finance Department" for the words "Department concerned."'

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—Motion moved:

'In line 2 for the words "for each Ministry" substitute the words "for the Finance Ministry;"

In lines 4 and 5 at the end substitute the words "Finance Department" for the words "Department concerned."'

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is not a new matter that I am placing before the House for its consideration. On the last occasion when I made my budget speech I made a passing reference to it. I am fully convinced that at the present moment there is a great need for setting up the Standing Committees of the type that I am going to suggest. The problem

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.)

is very simple and the need is very urgent. We all know that democracy functions by committees, by consultation, by advice, by collaboration and discussion with accredited representatives of the people. The object of these committees is to facilitate discussion and consultation. We all know that from almost every platform our national leaders and those in charge of the administration have said that without public co-operation to the fullest measure it is impossible to realise our objectives of economic planning in the country. To start with I must say that I consider that these committees are useful adjuncts of the administrative machinery in a democratic set-up and we cannot minimise the importance of these committees. I should like to refer briefly within the short time allowed to me under the rules to the historic development in connection with the setting up of these committees.

Sir, it was as far back as 1923 the Government of Mysore set up a Committee called Brijendra Nath Seal Committee for suggesting constitutional reforms in Mysore. I think a reference has been made in that very valuable report—it is a monumental report from all accounts—to these Standing Committees. Dr. Seal was very enthusiastic about it, and so very vehement about it. In fact, when he addressed the University Union of the Maharaja's College in 1921, he made out a very strong case for setting up of these Committees.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Minister for Finance).—That was when there was an irremovable Government.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The whole conception of Government has changed from 1923 to 1959. I know there is a complete change. I also indicate how as recently as 1951 and 1954, this Government alone had recognised the need to set up these committees. I am giving a historical background to this. Sir Brijendranath Seal said that it was very desirable to associate the representatives of the people, that is, legislators, in the consideration of important measures of Government. He has used a very valuable phrase. He has said in his report "to enlarge the scope and opportunities of Legislators to influence the administration of the State". I do not want the Hon'ble Members of the House to misinterpret the word 'influence'. He really meant that the pressure of public opinion, the status of these legislators, the value of their opinion, is likely to influence the course of administration. He wanted these committees to be purely advisory in character; beyond being advisory he did not want the scope of the committees to be anything different. He wanted also that the members of both the then Legislative Council and the then Representative Assembly to be represented. He wanted also the Minister in charge of portfolio to be the Chairman of the Committee. It was his considered view that all major questions of general policy which the Minister considers very necessary and desirable should be placed before the Standing Committee. Then, Sir, the Government passed orders on the Seal Committee Report in 1924 and also framed rules consistent with the Government Order and they set up only three Committees in 1924. The first was the Committee for Railways, Electricity and Public Works; the Second Committee was for Local Self-Government, Medicine and Public Health and the third was for Finance and Taxation. They were the only three Committees that were set up. These Committees were also expected to hold office for one year. Probably, it was their intention that the Hon'ble Members of the Houses of Legislature should get their chance in turn. There was one other important proviso that he added to the Constitution of these Committees and that was that the Minister could dispense with the necessity of placing such matter of importance which he considers unnecessary to be placed before that Committee. It is not that every member of that Committee had a right to see every matter was brought before them, but the Minister could decide which of the matter could be brought before the Committee. Then, there was another suggestion that the proceeding of the

meetings of these Committees were strictly confidential and it was not open to the members of the press. This was the background of setting up of these Committees as far back as 1924. Well, Sir, it was not as if Mysore was the only State or State Government which had adopted this procedure of setting up Standing Committees for helping the administration but I understand even the Government of India was constituting Standing Committees. I had an occasion to get the printed proceedings of the Government setting up these Committees and according to that arrangement, in the Government of India, each Minister had to place the programme of works of each Ministry before the Committee and he had to obtain the opinion of these Members. It was felt that it was made easier for each Ministry to push through the proposals of the Government if parliamentary members had been consulted and agreement on outlines had been reached. One other important suggestion that was made by the Government of India in their order was, that merely setting up of these Standing Committees never meant that they wanted to burke discussion on the floor of the Parliament; they said that it had nothing to do with the usual discussion that took place; what was really meant was it would facilitate discussion with understanding of the Government's point of view, with an inner knowledge of the circumstances that led the Government to take certain deccisions. Actually the Government of India felt that it would help discussion, would promote discussion at a high level with an intelligent understanding of the problems and issues involved. As far back as 1951, after the new Constitution of India was passed, in January or February, we in Mysore passed a similar order. I remember, Sir, Sri Venkatappa was then the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly and even he as Speaker of the Assembly was consulted; the Government elicited public opinion in various ways and they came to the conclusion that those Standing Committees were useful. One thing was clear; neither of these committees, either in the Government of India or in the Mysore State, had a statutory existence; no rule was prescribed at any stage; it was not the intention of the Government to prescribe any rules for the simple reason that it would stifle frank and free discussion. Once the limit is set to the scope of the discussion, and rules of proceedure regulate the discussion, it becomes rather difficult to be free and frank. In view of that, they did not consider it to be a statutory body. As many as 11 Standing Committees were formed by the Government of Mysore and they were for Finance, Agriculture, Food and Civil Supplies combined into one, Education, Electricity, Public Works Department, Medical and Public Health, Local Self-Government, Industries and Commerce, Labour, Rural Development and Commerce, Publicity and Information. That shows what a lot of vision the Government had to include Publicity and Information Department so that it could publicise the activities of the Government so that the man in the street should realise and visualise what part the Government played in his life and he could understand the problems of Government. So, I want to ask the Government as to what happened to these committees. Even in regard to the constitution, the Minister was expected to be the Chairman of these Committees and six members from the Assembly were supposed to be elected by a simple majority. But there was one aspect of it which I do not like and that was the Government had the privilege of nominating three members to these Standing Committees of each Department or Ministry. Then the Secretary was to be nominated by the Minister concerned and that was an Officer of the Department or Departments concerned. Well, Sir, there was a very definite indication in the Government Order that all non-official bills introduced or proposed to be introduced had to be previously discussed. Important measures that the Government wanted to take or legislative enactments that the Government wanted to pass have also had to be discussed

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.)

at these Standing Committees. Then the report of the various Committees, including the type of the Committee suggested by my Hon'ble friend Sri Veerappa, if it had been constituted; had to be discussed and views expressed or recorded. Then, Sir, major questions of policy, and financial proposals had necessarily to be discussed. The annual reports of the Departments which have been so much neglected now and for which you take four years to publish.....

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—You will have a brief report now. It is already under print. From next year we will have regular reports.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—These annual Administration Reports will lose their value and signficance if they come after three years. Just as in the case of industrial concerns we want trial balance sheets, instead of making it bulky, give a summary of the main activities, the amount spent, the amount surrendered and the main features of the administration of each department. Even these reports were expected to be discussed. I am saying with full knowledge of what happened because I happened to be associated with more than one of these Committees and very useful work was being done at each of these Committees. Another opportunity that was afforded to the members of this Committee was that, if any member felt that there was a matter of public importance or even of local importance which should be brought to the notice of the Ministry, even those matters were allowed to be discussed. There were two important exceptions in regard to the working of this Committee and they were that two subjects were excluded from their purview. One was relating to appointment because Government did not want that to be made a forum for getting accused of jobbery and all that kind of thing. The Government Order specified that questions relating to appointments should be strictly kept out of the purview of the Standing Committee. I am giving these details because there may be various criticisms to the effect that after all what is the value of these Committees and why should these matters be discussed and so on and so forth. I am asking Government as to what exactly happened and why these Committees were discontinued and under what conditions and circumstances. Did anything very serious happen in the middle that provoked Government to discontinue them ?

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

There was another important matter which made it very useful for the administration to have these Committees and that was that whenever a Secretary to Government in a Ministry had to submit a file to the Minister on a major question of policy or on a matter of urgent importance, there was a regular circular to the effect that he should note what was the opinion of the Standing Committee on that subject. He had to say that the opinion of the Standing Committee on the Public Health and Medical Department was such and such. I know of occasions when the Minister returned the files asking what is the opinion of the Standing Committee. I have seen the files of this kind going about in the Secretariat from room to room. The argument might be put forward that these Committees were all right in the set up where the Representative Assembly was only a representative body making representations or when full-fledged democracy was not functioning in this State. Subsequent to that, even after the passing of the Constitution on the 26th January 1950, these Committees have been functioning. I want to invite the attention of the House to what is now happening in the Lok Sabha even today. My information is that there are as many as 18 Committees functioning The minimum number for each Committee is 30 and the maximum number is 60. The idea of these Committees is that, as we in Mysore contemplated as far back as 1903, the Ministers called the major Heads of Departments and Secretaries to Government for discussion in these group meetings and there were as many groups as there were

Ministries. These meetings are held without fail during each session of the Lok Sabha and once or twice when the Lok Sabha is not in session. I understand that every Minister at the Centre has found these Committees to be of inestimable value in helping him to carry on administration. It is stated that these members who constitute these Standing Committees have the necessary background material for making their speeches on the floor of the Lok Sabha and that it has also increased the quality of debate. They have been a source of great benefit both to the members of the Lok Sabha and to the Ministers. Having regard to these facts, I should like to impress on the present Ministry the need to revive these Standing Committees and to place them on a satisfactory basis. I am quite prepared to meet the objections from any quarter in regard to this matter. Under the new Constitution, I want that both the Houses of Legislature should be represented because under the Constitution of 1950 the members of the Legislative Council were kept out for the simple reason that the old Legislative Assembly of the State alone was considered to be a State Legislature. I do not know if there is a legal or constitutional objection to these members sitting in the Standing Committee. I think both the Houses should be represented on those Committees in an adequate measure, the proportion being left to them. Even if other States or State Legislatures do not adopt this, since we have had the experience of over 40 years, this is a matter which would be acceptable to us. An objection may be raised on the ground of T.A. and D.A. which will have to be paid to them. I am not one of those who would consider items of T.A. and D.A. in such matters to be of very great importance. I won't mind Ministers touring. They must tour for more than 10 days in a month. Looking at it from another point of view, any amount of expenditure incurred by Ministers, in touring should *not be* objected to because I consider that Ministers' tours are in public interest. If a Minister chances to pass by a village, the people in that locality can take advantage of his visit. I would therefore say that these Standing Committees are very useful and we should not mind expenditure on account of their T.A. and D.A. You should not mind these Committees meeting twice a year or once or twice during every budget session and during the legislative session.

One other matter I want to bring to the notice of the House is that since this is a matter of election, there may not be any objection from any party. I want the system of election to be a little different from the simple majority system so as to allow scope for all other parties also to be represented on these Committees. We do not want to introduce in these Standing Committees any illwill or misunderstanding and all sections of the House holding different view-points should be represented on these Committees because it would be in the best interest of democracy and administration to see that full representation is given.

Having said this, I commend this resolution to the House for its acceptance and I will be ready to meet any objections that may be put forward.

MR. SPEAKER.—The House now rises and will meet tomorrow at 1 P.M.

The House adjourned at Six of the Clock to meet again at One of the Clock on Friday, the 3rd April 1959.

WD 644—GPB—900—11-11-59